

REMARKS

The present Amendment is in response to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed April 10, 2006. Claims 1, 9, and 10 are amended and new claims 11-15 are added. Claims 1-15 are now pending in view of the above amendments.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks. For the Examiner's convenience and reference, Applicant's remarks are presented in the order in which the corresponding issues were raised in the Office Action.

Please note that the following remarks are not intended to be an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between any cited references and the claimed invention. Rather, the distinctions identified and discussed below are presented solely by way of example to illustrate some of the differences between the claimed invention and the cited references. In addition, Applicants request that the Examiner carefully review any references discussed below to ensure that Applicants understanding and discussion of the references, if any, is consistent with the Examiner's understanding.

I. 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph on the grounds that the specification does not contain support for the element "rigidly attaching" or enable one of ordinary skill to make and/or use the invention. The Applicants respectfully disagree and point to Figures 4a and 4b of the specification which clearly showing an example of an optical assembly rigidly attached to a printed circuit board. However, the Applicants have deleted the recitation of a "rigid" attachment from claims 1, 9, and 10. Therefore, the rejection of claims 1, 9, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph is moot.

II. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a/b/e)

The Examiner rejects claims 1-4 and 6-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by *Card et al* (United States Patent No. 5,295,214). Because *Card* does not teach or suggest

each and every element of the rejected claims, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection in view of the following remarks.

A claim is anticipated under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), (b), or (e) only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Further, the identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. Finally, the elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *Manual of Patent Examining Procedure* (“MPEP”) § 2131.

Card teaches a flexible ribbon cable 110 for electrically connecting the leads of an optical subassembly 102 to pads 120 of an electrical circuit 122. The electrical circuit 122 is on a top surface of a rigid interconnect structure 124. See col. 4, line 48 - col. 5 line 3 and Figure 2. As clearly shown in Figure 2, the optical subassembly 102 is mechanically supported by lower part 150. *Card* further describes that the “optical sub-assemblies may also be fixed in position by an adhesive such as epoxy or allowed limited movement ...” Col. 5, lines 40-43.

In direct contrast, the rejected claims specifically require that the “lead frame connector provides mechanical support for the optical sub-assembly.” The Examiner has not established that the flexible ribbon cable 110 of *Card* provides mechanical support for an optical sub-assembly. In fact, Figure 2 of *Card* clearly shows that the optical subassembly 102 is mechanically supported by lower part 150. In direct contrast, Figures 4a and 4b of the Applicant’s disclosure clearly show optical subassemblies 10 and 20 mechanically supported by lead frame connectors 12 and 22 respectively. According to these embodiments, the Applicant’s invention does not require epoxy reinforcement or other support structures that are required by the teachings of *Card*. See paragraph [0012] of the Applicant’s disclosure. Thus, the Examiner has not established that *Card* teaches each and every element of the rejected claims as required for a *prima facie* case of anticipation. Since *Card* does not teach the methods being claimed in this application, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

B. Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over *Card* in view of *Liu et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0026081).

Claim 5 depends from claim 1. If an independent claim is nonobvious under 35 U.S.C. 103, then any claim depending therefrom is nonobvious. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Therefore, the Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn at least for the same reasons as claim 1.

III. NEW CLAIMS

Claims 11-15 have been added and depend from claim 1. Therefore, claims 11-15 are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 1.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe the claims as amended are in allowable form. In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, or which may be overcome by an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 9th day of October, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/David A. Jones/ Reg. # 50,004

DAVID A. JONES

Registration No. 50,004

Attorney for Applicant

Customer No. 022913

Telephone: (801) 533-9800

DAJ:jbh
W:\15436\446.1\ML0000003702V001.doc